



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HAECKEL'S THESES. A PROTEST.

Though I feel happy to belong to those of whom Ernst Haeckel says that the clear insight into the evolution of the world not only satisfies the causal feeling of their reason,* but even their highest emotional cravings, I, on the other hand, quite agree with the great German naturalist that for most educated people of our time monism is destined to be the connecting link between religion and science, and I much appreciate his theses for the organization of monism.

Now I should like to make a few remarks concerning the criticism upon those theses in the January number of *The Monist* (Vol XVI, pp. 120-123), as it has roused my contradiction in several points.

First of all, when looking again through the German text of the theses, I am unable to find that their formulation is "slovenly, and made without due precaution." I should call it clear and uncompromising. And that is what is wanted in our present time, where in most countries a lukewarm tendency is shown in science as well as in politics to reconcile two irreconcilable principles: papism and free thought and teaching.

Further, as regards Kant's doctrine of the *a priori* there is, in my opinion, nothing astonishing that he should reject it, who does not believe in apriorism.

I also can not understand will to be free, when it can not "will as it pleases," and I, therefore, accept determinism in the sense of Haeckel and Paul Rée. Nor can I help, after many years of biological studies, taking it for an established fact that man is nothing else but a social animal most likely descended from one common ancestor with the now living anthropoid apes. When speaking about man, we have not only to think of the highly cultured *homo sapiens* "with all his wealth of moral ideals and scientific attainment," but also of the savage man, who mentally is more closely allied to the ape than, for instance, the critic of Haeckel's theses.

Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge, Ernst Haeckel never disregards in his works the evolutionary phase in religion and science, but he naturally feels no sympathy with the past, where it wilfully hampered the progress of science. The fetishism in Central Africa and in the Celestial Empire did and does, on the

* Undoubtedly our correspondent here has in mind Schopenhauer's phrase so difficult to translate into English: "Das Causalbedürfniss befriedigen."

other hand, very little, if at all, impede Western civilization, and needed, therefore, not to be mentioned by Professor Haeckel together with the Christian superstitions, nor was there for the same reason any necessity for the courageous philosopher of Jena to denounce the "wild theories" alluded to in the article under review.

PAUL VON RAUTENFELD.

SWATOW, CHINA.

EDITORIAL REPLY.

We take pleasure in publishing Herrn von Rautenfeld's protest against our criticism of Professor Haeckel's theses. It proves that our monistic friend of Jena has staunch supporters all over the world, even in Swatow of distant China, but having read Herrn von Rautenfeld's arguments we do not feel compelled to change our views. The Editor of *The Monist* is a personal friend of Professor Haeckel, but the cause of monism would not be well served if for the sake of politeness he would abstain from criticism and avoid controversy.

In former numbers we have discussed our differences with Professor Haeckel, and there is no need of repeating them.* Be it sufficient here to state that we deem these differences of great importance because their recognition would prevent monism from being narrowed down to a onesided partisan issue, and we feel convinced that Professor Haeckel himself would accept our view if we could have a quiet hour's talk with him.

A LETTER FROM PROFESSOR MACH.

The July number of *The Monist* contained an editorial article on "Professor Mach's Philosophy" written in reply to Dr. Hans Kleinpeter's essay "On the Monism of Professor Mach," which appeared in the April number. Dr. Kleinpeter in his enthusiasm for the master whose lead he follows had been carried away in some of his statements to such an extent as to render Professor Mach's

* "Professor Haeckel's Monism and the Ideas of God and Immortality," *The Open Court*, V, 2957 (Sept. 17, 1891); "Professor Haeckel's Confession of Faith," *The Open Court*, VII, 3529 (Jan. 1893); "Monism not Mechanicism," *The Monist*, II, 438; "Professor Haeckel's Monism," *The Monist*, II, 598; "Theology as a Science," *The Monist*, XIII, 24; "Haeckel's Theses for a Monistic Alliance," *The Monist*, XVI, 120.